

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted supplementary to the previous Amendment and in connection with the interview with the Examiner and filing of a Request for Continuing Examination.

During the interview the Examiner's highly beneficial cooperation has been gratefully acknowledged.

Claim 1, the broadest claim which was rejected over the art, was discussed. It was explained that in the method of the present invention as defined in claim 1 all winding sides 36 are plastically reshaped before being inserted into the slot to permanently assume the slot shape 119.

It was determined that additional clarification would be needed. In connection with this, applicant has submitted another independent claim 21 which additionally defines that all the winding sides are plastically reshaped before being inserted in the slot to permanently assume the slot shape which corresponds to a shape of each slot.

It is believed that claim 1 as it is clearly and patentably

distinguishes from the prior art. As defined in claim 1 "all the winding sides" are pressed into a slot shape and plastically reshaped for being inserted into the slot to permanently assume the slot shape. As was explained in the previous Amendment, In contrast in the patent to Adachi the winding sides are adjusted or reshaped to the groove opening, in two dimensions, or in other words only from two sides. Thus the language that all winding sides are reshaped, (or in other words three winding sides are reshaped) clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the patent to Adachi.

Claim 21 additionally defines that the reshaping is performed with respect to all three winding sides to provide the slot shape which substantially corresponds to a shape of each slot (or in other words three dimensional shape of each slot), in contrast to the patent to Adachi in which this is not so.

Claim 22 define the features which are shown in the drawings, in particular in Figures 6A and 6B. Figure 6B shows how the windings being processed. The corresponding description is provided on page 13, starting from line 17. It is completely clear that the cross-section of all core winding sides are plastically reshaped.

The patent to Adachi does not show any windings with plastically reshaped cross-sections. Therefore the patent to Adachi is not relevant for the patentability of the present invention. The patent to Rich shows how to manufacture a stator core. Rich does not give any hints or any details about windings. Therefore, the patent to Rich is also not relevant for the patentability of the claims.

The patents to Fisher, Miura and Hyang also do not disclose the new features of the present invention as defined in this claim.

Claim 22 should also be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.


It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 clearly and patentably distinguishes the present invention from the prior art. Claims 21 and 22 which contain additional features that also clearly and patentably distinguishes the present invention from the prior art.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the

specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233